DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 670 RC 002 538

By- Hughes, John F.; And Others
FOCUS ON INNOVATION.
California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Office of Compensatory Education.
Pub Date Jan 68
Note- 24p.
EDRS Price MF- $0.25 HC- $1.04
Descriptors- BILINGUAL STUDENTS, *COMMUNICATION SKILLS, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION, CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED, EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED, ENGLISH (SECOND LANGUAGE), ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS, INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING, INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION, INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION, INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES, *MIGRANT CHILDREN, OUTDOOR EDUCATION, REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION, *SPANISH SPEAKING, *SUMMER PROGRAMS
Identifiers- Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, ESEA, Title I, Office of Economic Opportunity

Summer educational programs held in 7 California school districts and funded by Title I, ESEA, are described in this issue of Focus on Innovation. Programs of remedial instruction and enrichment were developed to assist the educationally disadvantaged, primarily in the area of communication skills. Selection of students, framework of the programs, and evaluation processes are discussed. An extract from an interview with John F. Hughes, Director of the Division of Compensatory Education, U.S. Office of Education, is presented relative to federal funding of summer programs. (JEH)

RECEIVED
JUL 10 1968
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

OFFICE OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

FOCUS

ON

INNOVATION

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Max Rafferty—Superintendent of Public Instruction
Sacramento 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED021670
RC002538

INTRODUCTION

One of the primary responsibilities of all agencies participating in ESEA, Title I is dissemination of information. All projects must include a procedure for selecting and disseminating information to teachers, administrators and other persons or agencies involved in development of compensatory education projects. Such information will make available to school districts the latest educational developments and experiments for use in project planning and operation. Costs of printing and disseminating information are a legitimate expense.

FOCUS ON INNOVATION will be compiled and distributed by the Program Development Unit in the Office of Compensatory Education on a quarterly basis, in an attempt to exchange information concerning compensatory education to educators in California. We are deeply indebted to the authors who have so generously shared their excellent programs.

This third issue focuses on summer projects. Summer provides a unique time in which to develop innovative curricular approaches and teaching strategies. Buildings are available throughout a district, and there is often an abundant supply of equipment, materials and supplies. The relaxed atmosphere of summer can provide for flexible planning, additional cultural enrichment, specific diagnostic services, specialized in-service training, inter-group experiences and intensive experimentation. Students very often are even more receptive to learn, and the usual inactivity resulting in educational regression among disadvantaged youth is terminated.

The opening article for this issue has been taken from extracts of an interview with John F. Hughes, Director, Division of Compensatory Education, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, United States Office of Education. The complete interview was originally published in the March issue of Nation's Schools.

WILSON C. RILES
Director
Office of Compensatory Education

RUTH LOVE HOLLOWAY
Chief
Program Development Unit

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY L. C. Hickman, Editor Nation's Schools (McGraw-Hill, INC.) TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

January 1968

Volume II - Issue 1

Title	Page
INTRODUCTION	i
HOW TO USE FEDERAL FUNDS FOR SUMMER PROGRAMS (An Interview with John F. Hughes)	1
SCHOOL DISTRICTS DESCRIBE TITLE I PROJECTS	
Compton City School District Leonard C. Erickson, Superintendent	4
Gridley Elementary School District Donovan Davis, Superintendent	6
Pittsburg Unified School District Charles E. Haworth, Superintendent	9
San Diego City School District Ralph Dailard, Superintendent	12
San Jose Unified School District George M. Downing, Superintendent	14
Santa Barbara City School District Norman B. Scharer, Superintendent	16
Yuba City Unified School District C. A. Summy, Superintendent	20

HOW TO USE FEDERAL FUNDS FOR SUMMER PROGRAMS

John F. Hughes, Director
Division of Compensatory Education
Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education
United States Office of Education

In this interview, Dr. Hughes uses lessons learned last year to tell schoolmen how to plan, finance and organize the right kind of public school summer programs for 1967.

WHAT TYPE OF SUMMER PROGRAMS WOULD U.S.O.E. LIKE TO ENCOURAGE?

Hughes: We hope the emphasis will be focused on planning for follow-up of preschool at the primary level. Our reports show that last summer the most successful accomplishments came out of programs for preschool and primary grade children. Remedial and corrective programs in the child's later years may be more costly and are often less productive. I think the payoff on prevention is pretty clear.

WHAT SHOULD SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS BE DOING NOW TO PLAN FOR NEXT SUMMER?

Hughes: Well, first of all, they should take careful stock of the children they will serve to see what their needs are. What kinds of deficiencies and failures can be prevented? If you know this, then you can start looking for the right teachers with the right skills and match them up with the kids.

Second, the schools should look at themselves and their entire professional team. If special training programs are needed, plan for them.

Third, arrangements should be started now for the cultural, recreational and enrichment aspects of the summer preschool program.

Fourth, people concerned with planning should read the report on the 1966 summer programs submitted to the President by the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children.

They should particularly note the criticisms--so that fewer mistakes will be made next summer. This report is being mailed to school administrators, and is available from my office. Many of the problems, you know, were caused by too much rigidness in the programs. What is needed is freedom of action--the willingness to experiment.

Finally, I think school administrators should call on their state departments of education or the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, if necessary, if they need extra help in planning.

WHAT WAS YOUR IMPRESSION OF LAST SUMMER'S TITLE I PROGRAMS?

Hughes: As I said, there were mistakes. And some of them were pretty big. But by and large, I think the use of funds was good. The money spurred many districts to do some unusual and imaginative things. Look at

Mongomery County, Md., for example. They had a five-week summer program for children with hearing problems because many of these children tend to regress in the summer when the special attention they get in the regular school year has stopped. Sixty children from Tulare City, California, covered more than 3,500 miles in their state over five weeks, visiting historic sites and living with various families, in an enrichment project called "Widening Horizons." There were many projects for children strengthened by a closely related program of teacher training.

SHOULD SCHOOLS TRY TO GET MONEY FROM THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AND COMBINE IT WITH TITLE I MONEY FOR NEXT SUMMER?

Hughes: Yes. Many of the best programs last year were financed by the two programs. It is possible, for example, to use the O.E.O. money to provide the ancillary services--health care, food, and other social services--and keep the Title I money for getting top teachers. The teacher, you know, is the crux of the situation.

WHAT ABOUT OVER-ALL BUDGETING? HOW MUCH SHOULD GO INTO THE SUMMER PROGRAM?

Hughes: That's difficult to say. It ranged widely last summer. But I would guess that perhaps a quarter of the district's total Title I allocation would be about right.

WHAT DO YOU THINK THE TEACHER-PUPIL RATIO FOR PRESCHOOL CLASSES SHOULD BE?

Hughes: That depends on the activity. Each school district should carefully look at teacher load in relation to the activity.

SHOULD TEACHER AIDES AND EXTRA PERSONNEL BE USED IN THESE PROGRAMS?

Hughes: Definitely. The more attention we can give these children, the better. Aides, and volunteers too, are much needed to share the load and help the teacher.

DO YOU HAVE ANY IDEAS ON THE APPROPRIATE EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL FOR A SUMMER PROGRAM?

Hughes: It's misleading to talk in terms of dollars because of the great variety of costs among school systems. What seems more important is to answer in terms of program. Summer is the time when schools are able to really concentrate on educationally deprived children, and this should be reflected in a rich educational diet. For example, it is possible to keep class size very low and provide real individual attention. Health services, psychological services, home visitations, work with parents, and good teacher in-service programs are possible. Equipment, supplies and materials are in abundant supply. Of course, all this isn't cheap, but it is about time we used the summer to concentrate resources for real educational gains instead of operating as if the constraints of the school year operate in the summer also.

ONE LAST QUESTION: HOW SHOULD THE SCHOOL PERSON BE VIEWING THE SUMMER PROGRAMS? I MEAN, IS THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE SCHOOL YEAR CHANGING AND AFFECTING HIS ROLE?

Hughes: I think it is. While we traditionally have looked at the school year as having two semesters and a summer break, now we're beginning to see the immense possibilities of the summer as a time of special learning opportunity. We have found out that it does no one any good to close up shop for the summer--and the children, it seems to us, are more receptive to learning then--that is if the summer program is a good one. The more relaxed atmosphere can make school attractive to them in summer, even when it is a burden in the regular school year. I guess it has to do with the fact that you can go places and do things that can't be done when you're watching the clock, listening for the bell, and ticking off the terms and semesters. Teachers are finding out, too, that what they can learn over an experimental summer can be the stepping stone to change for the better in the regular school program.

INNOVATIONS WITH TITLE I

Leonard C. Erickson, Superintendent
Compton City School District

The Compton City Schools, eighteen K-6 elementary plants, with a student population of over 16,000, has existed for 97 years at the lowest legal tax rate applied to the second lowest assessed value in Los Angeles County.

Our main program emphasis has been to increase reading and language skills, and to improve the child's self-image.

The ESEA Title I project has been titled "FORWARD TOGETHER" and consists of the following components: Resource Teachers, Instructional Materials Centers, Summer School, Curriculum Guide, English as a Second Language, Equipment, and Nurses' Aides.

The resource teachers help to meet the unique needs of the culturally disadvantaged child by giving demonstration lessons, assisting teachers and teams with planning, and preparing materials. They also orient new teachers, and provide release time for teachers to observe superior instruction.

The Instructional Materials Centers provide a facility for teaching using a multi-media approach, books and materials for both the child and his teacher, and a place for an extended day, providing an enriched study environment. These centers were constructed by remodeling classrooms. Modern lighting, paneling, and carpets have produced excellent facilities at low cost. Four centers have been constructed, two more are being built into the two new schools under construction in the district, and our ultimate goal is one per school.

An enriched summer school was conducted by teachers who first took a course in remedial reading techniques, then applied them during the summer session. Much of this assistance was on an individual basis. There were 31 of these teachers each of whom worked with two groups every day. To further back up this program Title I and OEO provided 99 teacher aides for the summer.

The curriculum guide was written during the summer by a committee of 26 teachers of proven ability in working with culturally inexperienced children. This, we believe, is a great step forward, utilizing the experience of a large reservoir of trained brain power. For the first time in the history of the district a committee of teachers developed a guide for all the teaching staff. One feature we feel is unique is that it is a loose-leaf binder and labeled "draft"--it invites use and criticism.

Another innovation is the E.S.L. program for the Spanish-speaking children. For the first time in this district special efforts are being made to meet this need. Two teachers are serving in two schools to develop this program into an effective avenue for aiding bilinqual children. The resource teacher, in a third school, works with the E.S.L. program for two hours daily.

Many teachers and principals find that adequate equipment for their schools is innovative. With the history of underfinancing, noted earlier, it is not surprising to find that the advent of basic equipment, such as sound projectors, tape recorders, and film strip projectors, in adequate quantity, and materials for use with this equipment, is regarded as innovative.

The nurses' aides do much to "stretch" the nurse over her whole range of duties. The nurse is freed to do more for the children and can assist teachers more with health education. These aides are parents from the school attendance area.

The evaluative process set in motion by these projects, a process by which all programs and practices and policies have been subjected to a hard look, has established a better direction for all district practices. This continuous evaluation has spread far beyond the confines of Title I and target schools. It has permeated the district, resulting in a climate of change. With such a climate, and a few funds, changes do occur, POSITIVE changes; the computer tells us so, better staff morale tells us so; and successful, happy children tell us so.

Compton utilizes other funded programs to enrich the reading program within a coordinated Title I structure. With Senate Bill 28 funds Compton City schools is experimenting with a special reading program in five schools in which two teachers teach reading in a classroom at one time. The teachers are divided into teams of four with one teacher acting as the lead teacher who teaches reading in each of the three other classrooms. The classes are divided into four reading groups which are flexible and change as the needs of the pupils dictate. The lead teacher teaches two groups and the regular classroom teacher teaches two groups. At another time during the day the lead teacher returns to the room at which time some phase of the language arts program is taught. Usually the two teachers divide the class into four groups and teach written language or follow-up activities in reading in accordance with pupil needs. Each team evaluates the progress of the program daily and plans for the needs of the pupil. A regular weekly meeting is also scheduled at which time the team discusses various reading problems. The principal also meets weekly with each of the team leaders to discuss the progress of the program.

This is an attempt to upgrade the entire reading program. The lead teacher program operates in the primary grades and in the fourth grade in the following schools: Rosecrans, Washington, El Segundo, Willard and Jefferson. Two other schools, not in the ESEA Title I project, (OEO funded) are participating on a limited scale. This program involves 32 special reading teachers as well as six Communication Skills teachers.

Plans for the immediate future encompass an in-service program to train or retrain, as appropriate, first and second grade teachers in reading. Concurrently the resource teachers and teacher assistants to the principals will be given a series of workshops in reading to insure the application of a variety of reading techniques appropriate to the disadvantaged child.

BUTTE COUNTY COMBINES FUNDS FOR MIGRANT CHILDREN PROGRAM

Donovan Davis, Superintendent, Gridley Elementary School District

In Butte County during the summer of 1967, funds from several sources were put together to provide a program for migrant children and their families at Gridley. This program was most rewarding in terms of results for children, and an administrative headache in terms of operation. The part that made the administration of the program worthwhile was that 150 migrant children from ages 5 months to 12 years received a real thrust in terms of education, child care and health services. In fact, as this article is written, over 100 children are still receiving services.

The most rewarding feature from our administrative point of view, aside from the things that happened with the children, is the complete dedication of the personnel of the various agencies in providing a program which included the migrants as participants. The cooperation of the Community Services Bureau, Office of Compensatory Education, under the direction of Leo Lopez and his staff, the Office of Economic Opportunity, Chico State College, The Public Health Department, Butte Housing Authority, Gridley Union Schooi District, our own Butte County staff, and Esparto School District in Yolo County, enabled us to put together funds which provided a rather comprehensive program for our migrants.

There are several components to the operation which could be of interest to the readers. The first component related to education of school age children. This component is not particularly new to Gridley as it has been in operation for several years. Parts of the program, however, are different from those of preceding years. In 1966 the education of the children was conducted at the Gridley Migrant Labor Camp in 10'x 50' trailers and was funded by O.E.O. In 1967, the school day portion of the program was conducted in the Gridley schools and the children were transported to the schools. To add depth and dimension to the program, children went to the Child Care Center at 5:30 a.m. where they were fed breakfast and helped to get ready to go to school. After they returned from school in the afternoon, their educational program was continued at the Center with special instruction in art, crafts, music, and any academic areas where they needed special help. The Title I ESEA Migrant Amendment funds supported this phase of the project. There was an additional feature to the program which added strength and vitality to the instruction. Fourteen teachers in an NDEA Institute for Training Teachers of Disadvantaged Youth at Chico State College were assigned to Gridley to work particularly with the migrant children and their families during the summer session. These fourteen people reduced staff ratios in the instructional program at Gridley Elementary School to about 1 to 10, and many good things happened to children because of their close contact with teachers. In Gridley there was the advantage of having Sister John Bosco of Pittsburg, Pennsylvania as the Director of the NDEA teachers for a 3-year period. Her religious affiliation was a real security factor for the children, most of whom are Roman Catholic. Likewise, five of the teachers were bi-lingual, which added to the depth of the program for the children.

To further add to the depth of the program, fourteen college students were chosen by the Bureau of Compensatory Education to be trained to work with migrant children and their families. Funded under a contract with the Esparto School District and sub-contracted to the Butte County Superintendent of Schools, these people were given two weeks of training in June under the direction of Dr. Arley Howsden of Chico State College and then sent out to migrant camps all over California for the summer. They returned for a week's evaluation and further training the last week in August. Two of these remained in Gridley where they had the benefit of working with the NDEA Institute teachers in providing additional services to children. In addition, they conducted adult education programs in both Spanish and English for the migrant families, contacted social agencies where families needed help, and provided music instruction for the children. Reports indicate that other people in the program did similar things in the other camps.

The criteria for selection of these people being trained and the process of payment to them was interesting. The basic criteria were that they were migrants themselves or children of migrants, had at least a high school diploma and a commitment to go to college, and were interested in pursuing a program which would enable them to work with migrants in some capacity such as teacher, social worker, etc.

Not all of the students met all of the criteria, but they were all carefully selected. Each of them had their educational expenses paid and received a monthly stipend for their services. The group was named the Mini-Corps, and the evaluation reports of the project will help chart plans for future training programs and also take an entirely new look at the program for training teachers. For if we have learned anything from these young people, it is that a person does not need five years of professional training before he begins to work with children and perform effectively.

Another major component of the project was the Day Care Center for children at the migrant labor camp. Under the direction of Mrs. Sara Haydon, more than 100 children, ages 5 months to 6 years, were cared for in our excellent facility from 5:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. while the parents worked. To staff this program Mrs. Haydon had three teacher assistants, 14 migrant mothers, four aides, and three cooks to provide the services which included meals, infant care, a nursery school program, health services and regular day-care activities. The staff worked closely with the Mini-Corps and NDEA teachers in providing a full program for the children. This part of the program was funded by the State Office of Economic Opportunity.

Complete physical and dental examinations were provided for the children, and follow-up treatment for problems was achieved under an arrangement with the Health Department and local doctors and dentists. In some cases problems which were severe were also referred to other agencies. Complete records of all the children have been kept, and will be sent to the locations where the migrants move. School records are also in condition to be sent immediately to requesting schools, and some records will accompany the families as they move to new locations for employment.

This, then, is the story of the program at Gridley for the 1967 summer. What happens now? Well, the schools are using a follow-up procedure with Title I, ESEA and migrant amendment funds for those children who remain in Gridley during the fall months. Adult Education programs are funded by O.E.O. to assist the parents to become better fitted to work and live in our society. Plans are also under way for the 1968 summer We think the mix is a good one.

A SUCCESSFUL SUMMER EXPERIENCE

Charles E. Haworth, Superintendent,
Pittsburg Unified School District

Shifting "Target Area" students from their own neighborhood schools to other newer schools in higher economic level residential areas was the unique pattern of a city-wide integrated summer school tried in the Pittsburg Unified School District during the summer of 1967. It was the initial attempt of the Pittsburg Unified School District to have students participate in a completely integrated instructional program during vacation time and is believed to be one of the few districts throughout the State of California willing to bus students out of ghetto area schools to the more affluent schools within the community.

During the summer of 1967, the Board of Education of the Pittsburg Unified School District authorized a city-wide integrated summer school plan for all educational levels (K-12) within the city of Pittsburg, California. Because this proposal was an initial attempt on the part of the Pittsburg Unified School District for a completely integrated summer school program, careful planning and coordination was carried on between Mr. Russell Gibbons, Pittsburg's Federal Project Director and Mr. Fred Tillman, Program Consultant, State Office of Compensatory Education.

The basic plan was unique and innovative since it authorized a city-wide centralization of schools by grade level. This experimental summer program allowed poverty area students from "target area" schools to be bussed to the more affluent, "non-target area" schools. Different grade levels were designated to specific schools outside the "target area."

It was anticipated that the exposure to different teachers, other pupils and an entirely new school surrounding would help provide additional stimulus for summer school enrollment.

All students who were enrolled in grades K-2 attended the Highlands Elementary School in the newest residential area in the community. All students enrolled in grades 3-5 attended Los Medanos Elementary School, another one of the city's newer elementary schools. Students in grades 5-8 attended Hillview Junion High School, also in a highly desirable residental area. The remaining students in grades 9-12 attended the only high school in the district, Pittsburg Senior High School.

This plan afforded the community its initial opportunity to deviate from its past practice of neighborhood summer schools. The goals of this particular summer school plan were: (1) to increase summer school enrollment; (2) to offer wider curricular choice; (3) to centralize schools by grade levels to all students; (4) to capitalize upon the teaching strengths of individual teachers; and (5) to provide an opportunity to experiment with a completely integrated summer school program.

Realizing the broad departure from past summer school practices, extensive planning on curricular offerings was undertaken. Special summer school brochures were prepared to explain the proposed summer program to parents and students. Courses were revamped and renamed to make them more inviting, such as, The Wonder of Science, The Wonder of Words, Sewing and Knitting Hints, Drama and the Stage, etc. Team teaching was inaugurated at the primary level with three teachers assigned to every two classes. Every effort was made to assure that summer school would not be a duplication of the regular academic school year. Classes at all levels were conducted in a relaxed, informal atmosphere with motivation being the keynote to the successful summer experience. The new course offerings emphasized instruction in remedial and enrichment areas.

Opportunity for students to broaden their cultural horizons were provided through participation in field trips, dramatic art, instrumental and vocal music and library activities.

The success of the effort was proved by the largest summer school enrollment that the district had ever experienced. There was some apprehension as to whether or not "target area" students would feel comfortable in another school and take advantage of this opportunity. However, 47 per cent of all the students attending were from "target area" schools.

Not only did this prove to be a highly successful venture for all of the students involved, but teachers from throughout the city were exposed to each other in a professional setting and were able to learn from each other. Many teachers were introduced to the problems of the impoverished child for the very first time. The greater awareness of the needs of the educationally deprived child became a constructive and challenging situation for the teachers. Lastly, teachers appreciated the opportunity of working in a relaxed, informal atmosphere void of the traditional grades and report cards.

The counselor-coordinator in charge of each building reported very minor, if any, racial or integration problems resulting from this initial attempt at a city-wide integrated program.

Evaluation of the summer school program was implemented through the use of parent, teacher and student questionnaires in addition to subjective teacher ratings on the progress of students enrolled in their summer classes.

In addition to the above mentioned summer school, the Pittsburg Unified School District also offered other summer experiences which included a ten day outdoor education experience for 340 "target area" youngsters, at the Silver Spur Lodge in the Sonora foothills. The outdoor education camp was the first camping venture that the majority of the children had experienced. Most of the children selected anticipated having no planned vacation and would have remained in the city for the entire summer. Priority in selection of students to participate was given to those students who were educationally disadvantaged and who had little or no outdoor education experience. Other summer components included use of elementary teacher aides in summer schools and a junior high counseling program for incoming seventh graders and their parents.

The success of these worthwhile summer experiences were well accepted by the community and the Pittsburg Board of Education. Its comprehensive and lasting value to both pupil and teacher cannot be denied.

The Pittsburg Unified School District Board of Education has reacted favorably to this initial integration experiment and has gone on record desiring to see the same type of summer program being considered for the summer of 1968 if financing can be secured.

MORE EFFECTIVE USE OF LANGUAGE

Ralph Dailard, Superintendent,
San Diego City Schools

San Diego is focusing on the basic communication skills--reading, writing, speaking, and listening. This emphasis on the more effective use of language by our disadvantaged target youngsters, which defines the major thrust of San Diego's compensatory education program, has been continued and reinforced during the summer months. Experienced teachers worked together to plan instruction and to develop curriculum guides and materials for courses such as corrective and developmental English and reading, which have been revamped to concentrate attention first on the most essential skills.

A broad summer session for 1966 was designed to continue and to reinforce the remedial and enrichment courses offered in many subjects during the regular year at the secondary level. Thirty-six teaching positions were utilized among six comprehensive schools, with a full-time parent counselor at each school to continue the work of maintaining home-school communication and to prevent dropping out during the summer. One parent counselor was assigned to work with the three adjustment-continuation schools in the Title I project.

Most extensive of the 1966 and 1967 summer programs on the elementary level was a seven-weeks diagnostic reading clinic in which 100 elementary school pupils were tested and examined to determine whether or not they could benefit from enrolling in the clinic for remedial help in reading during the regular school year. Ten teachers, a psychologist, a nurse, a visiting teacher, and a medical doctor conducted the diagnostic screening. Of the 100 children tested during the 1967 summer clinic, 36 pupils have been accepted into the year-round clinic for remediation of their specific reading disabilities.

Of outstanding motivational value were several courses offered for secondary students during the summer. Computer mathematics, in which a desk-sized computer was used by the students as an instructional and computational tool, stirred interest in mathematics among youngsters who had failed to respond to any other approach.

A technical course designed to prepare high school students for employment in the electronics field was continued during the summer session. Besides providing a training experience for the youngsters, the closed-circuit television system installed at Morse High School has proved an invaluable instructional aid. It has been useful in bringing enrichment experiences to students in the compensatory education program, as well as in the in-service training of teachers.

Among the many in-service opportunities for teachers participating in Title I programs have been college courses and workshops on subjects such as counseling, the teaching of English as a Second Language and reading,

preparation of instructional materials, and effective techniques in teaching disadvantaged younsters. For the benefit of San Diego's teachers and counselors, a group counseling session with teenagers was conducted by an authority in the field, who was invited here to demonstrate and discuss group counseling, particularly as it might be utilized in motivational advising.

Extensive curriculum writing workshops conducted during the summer months have enabled the compensatory education program to utilize the talents of master teachers in preparing curriculum guides and program materials for use during the regular school year. These workshops have served not only as training opportunities for able teachers, but also have resulted in the development of good instructional materials, prepared especially for use with disadvantaged youngsters.

Because of the curtailment of Title I funds, it has been necessary to reduce or eliminate some of the summer programs described here.

TITLE I - C.A.I.; YO PUEDO!

George M. Downing, Superintendent
San Jose Unified School District

Every day at 8:39 by the classroom clock, Mario Gabrera closes his social studies book, gets up quietly, and slips out the door to keep a rendezvous with a teletype machine.

Mario is thirteen years old.

In a turned-on generation, he is a turned-off kid.

Between 8:30 and 3:15, five days a week, he thinks he is one of the dumb ones, but he has learned not to betray himself to his classmates by asking dumb questions or giving dumb answers.

He prefers being labelled "sullen", "uncooperative". As such he has enjoyed the furtive admiration of certain of his peers.

Since the affair of the machine, Mario has begun to have some niggling doubts about himself. He plays his old role less convincingly, and some days he catches himself wondering if he may not be so dumb after all.

Mario Gabrera is one of 64 seventh and eighth graders in the Peter Burnett Junior High School who are helping to demonstrate the remedial values of a computer-based drill and practice mathematics program.

The program was sparked by a group of mathematics teachers, discouraged by their inability to meet the needs of some children and disenchanted with the no-results of professional table talk. It was coordinated by John Davis, Administrative Assistant, himself a mathematician and researcher, and piloted during a four weeks summer session.

Although the program was originally used in the self-contained elementary classroom, the summer school experiment demonstrated its adaptability to the time-blocked schedule of the Junior High.

In a random sampling of 6th, 7th and 8th graders of all ability levels, the most exciting evidences of success appeared at the top and the bottom levels.

The involvement of the children increased as the summer session advanced, and it was matched by growing enthusiasm on the part of the adults.

It is difficult, even today, to pin Will Hardy, the principal of that summer school, to an objective discussion of the mechanics of selection, scheduling, and supervision of the program.

He would rather talk about the little seventh grade girl who sat before the machine day after day, unresponsive to its whirring and clicking; until that one day when she poked a tentative finger at a key and was hooked.

He would rather talk about the attitudes of the teachers in and out of whose classrooms the children were moving every period, or about the children, themselves, who, with a minimum of supervision, left and arrived quietly and on time, started to work immediately, and clamored for more time on the machines.

This fall two terminals were installed in a doorless booth at one end of the principal's outer office at Peter Burnett Junior High School.

The sixty-four children selected to participate in the program were scheduled at ten minute intervals throughout the day with one minute at each end for leaving from and returning to class. Each child was made completely responsible for keeping his own appointments.

It is too early to draw conclusions, but the teachers and administrators at Peter Burnett are already convinced that this program has more to offer children like Mario than just improvement of arithmetic skills.

It offers each child ten minutes of individual attention every day, privacy in which to make mistakes, and an opportunity to make up deficiencies which block his progress.

The program's multiple level approach and unlimited range of drills insure his success.

The lessons are limited in content; he cannot get bogged down in vocabulary he does not understand, and the responses are immediate.

Every day he has an official looking print-out to take home. There are right answers on it, and his name is at the top.

This year at Peter Burnett Junior High School, Mario Gabrera is someone.

He has a machine at his disposal that looks as if it might have been borrowed from U.N.C.L.E. headquarters. Who knows? It just might be enough to turn him on.

PLANNING THE 1967 SIX-WEEK TITLE I SUMMER SCHOOL

Norman B. Scharer, Superintendent,
Santa Barbara City Schools

Since Title I aims at providing a continuous boost to the educationally disadvantaged, a second summer session was planned for children residing in the target area of the Santa Barbara School District.

The summer session of the Basic Skills Development Project was housed in four of the five public schools in the target area. Children in attendance came from five public and three parochial schools.

PRE-PLANNING WITH TARGET AREA PRINCIPALS

Grouping

Plans were made to group children in eighteen classes ranging in size from 14-22 pupils, with sessions lasting from 8:30 to 11:30 a.m. daily. The grouping was on a modified ungraded basis designed to provide the pupils with the greatest possible help in their most urgent areas of need. Six of the classes, composed of pupils from grades 1,2, and 3 had language development as their emphasis of work. Ten classes, with pupils from grades 3,4,5, and 6 had remedial reading as their primary focus. Two classes with pupils from kindergarten through grade 6 concentrated on English as a second language.

Selection of Children

Children were selected on the basis of greatest need for inclusion in this program. Low family income, lack of experiences needed for success in school, limited exposure to community resources, and the need for an improved self-image were the criteria used in making selections. Children were recommended for the program by the classroom teacher, considered by the principal and parents, and confirmed, where possible, by the Title I teacher who worked with many of the children during the school year.

Curriculum

The daily curriculum was designed to enrich the lives of the students as well as to aid them in improving their listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. Each classroom teacher provided systematic instruction and planned field trips to broaden the children's experiential world. Special teachers in children's literature, rhythms, art, and music worked, on a rotating basis, with all pupils in the four schools. Encouragement, success, and honest praise were the ingredients of all teaching.

The Bank Street Readers, with a multi-ethnic emphasis, were selected as the basal readers to provide opportunities for the children to identify with story-children with similar backgrounds. Since it was felt that handwriting influenced the child's effective use of the language, a concerted attempt was made to improve the handwriting of the pupils from grades 3-6. Physical Education provided a healthful break for the youngsters and generated pride and loyalty to the school group.

IN-SERVICE TRAINING

Two days of in-service meetings were held for all staff members on the Thursday and Friday before the start of the summer session. The in-service preparation for the summer provided a preview of the goals and the steps to their attainment as these were visualized by the director and the committee who planned the summer session. The committee was composed of Title I remedial reading teachers, a language development teacher, and principals.

Goals of the Summer School

The opening session focused on the objectives of the Title I Program. The sound filmstrip "Title I - Off and Running" provided a look at the possibilities for benefiting children under this Act. This film, produced and distributed by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, presented the reasons for the different kinds of programs.

The objectives to assist the teachers in planning their work for the six-week session, listed below, were distributed and explained to the entire staff.

(1) To help each child develop a positive self-image.

(2) To create opportunity for each child to experience enjoyment and success.

(3) To help each child maintain and increase the level of reading attained during the school year.

(4) To develop basic reading skills in a sequential pattern.

(5) To keep each child engaged in recreational reading.

(6) To provide interesting, stimulating experiences as a means of motivating and expanding each child's communication skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing.

(7) To increase each child's ability to spell and write legibly.

(8) To develop skill in listening purposefully.

(9) To provide enrichment in art, music, children's literature, and rhythms.

(10) To increase each child's awareness of beauty around him.

Language Development

The in-service meetings dealt with the general aims of language development and the kinds of progress it was hoped the children would make during the brief term. Suggested course content included vocabulary building, conversational activities, critical observation, listening, functional

writing, and the incorporation of books and literature into the lives of the children. Techniques were provided to help both the teacher and the pupil evaluate progress. Specific suggestions were made to enable the teacher to work more effectively in language development.

Writing Skills

The techniques for teaching handwriting were reviewed after which teachers actually practiced writing. Then they used scales to evaluate their own handwriting.

Reading Skills

Two remedial reading teachers introduced the teachers to the philosophy and use of the Bank Street Readers. Attention focused on the development of sequential skills as presented in the manuals. The art of questioning to help children increase their vocabulary, develop concepts. etc., followed the introduction of the readers. In addition, questions illustrating the levels of reading (literal, interpretive, critical, and creative) were presented and discussed. Teachers then formulated their own questions to illustrate the various levels.

Field Trips and Films

The staff of the Title I Project developed a field trip guide. Methods were analyzed for making field trips effective, including utilization of the travel experiences going to and coming from the focus area of the trip. Suitable films for broadening the children's experiential background and the logistics problems associated with effective use of films were outlined during the workshop.

Enrichment Activities

Four special teachers in art, music, literature, and rhythms explained the activities they had devised for broadening the experiences of the different age groups of children. The art teacher explained how art experiences could enhance the life of a child from a poverty home and gave some typical examples of changed attitudes. Similarly, the music teacher explained ways in which music could form a bridge from home to school for these children. The sheer joy of rhythm activities was brought out clearly by the rhythms teacher with emphasis on the cross-cultural values of rhythms. Children's literature and its place in expanding the child's understanding of himself and his peers, the enchantment of the make-believe world, and the fascination of the stories as stimuli to the development of reading ability were all discussed by the literature teacher.

Use of Teaching Machines

There were demonstrations of teaching machines for improving and individualizing reading instruction. Teachers were given time to practice working with the machines and to become familiar with the little quirks that can be frustrating when encountered first in front of a class. Time was also provided for the teachers to explore the different materials such as SRA reading kits, games, books, etc. It was hoped that the new materials would interest children who had had little previous success in school.

Classroom Assistants and Volunteers

The classroom assistants and volunteers were provided with an outline and an opportunity to discuss ways of working in a school setting. Possible duties in working with children and ways of controlling the physical environment were outlined. Assistants were given instruction in how to work with parents, teachers, and other school personnel.

A self-evaluation form was used by which the paraprofessionals were encouraged to assess their (1) commitment to the program, (2) responsiveness to children, (3) desire for self-improvement, (4) sensitivity to outlined educational goals, (5) relations with staff, teachers, other aides, and parents, (6) personal characteristics such as grooming and dress. Teacher assistants were given lists of possible ways they might facilitate the work carried on in kingergarten, primary, and intermediate grades. The training was designed to help the paraprofessionals function independently, within the bounds of their authority, with a minimum amount of teacher supervision.

Culmination

It was suggested that each school plan a culmination featuring some of the highlights of the summer program for the purposes of giving the children an opportunity to draw the summer's work to a close and to perform before an audience. It was hoped that parents and interested persons in the community would be invited to attend in order to become aware of the local Title I programs and activities.

Evaluation

Checklists, parent questionnaires, anecdotal records, attendance records, etc., to be used for pre- and post-information to evaluate the summer session, were discussed so that all would understand the need and purpose of each instrument.

The workshop aimed at helping everyone become aware of the objectives so that all would be working in harmony. It was the hope of the committee planning the summer session that the six weeks would provide opportunities to try new materials and ideas and that classes be conducted in a relaxed atmosphere without some of the felt pressures of the regular school year.

FROM RETICENCE TO ENTHUSIASM

C. A. Summy, Superintendent,
Yuba City Unified School District

The eyes of the ten year old girl widened with amazement and surprise when the farmer motioned to her and said, "Would you like to try to milk the cow?" Somewhat hesitantly at first, then gathering courage as she moved forward, she got down beside him, reached under the cow and gave a quick, sharp tug. She squealed with delight when the milk frothed into the pail.

This little girl, a youngster of Mexican descent, was one of the pupils in the Yuba City Unified School District's Summer School Program under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. They were on a field trip to a local farm where the class of some 17 or 18 youngsters had the opportunity to see real "farm" animals--horses, ducks, pigs, chickens and, of course, cows. They had opportunities to touch all the animals and, as was pointed out earlier, milk the cow, pet calves, and everyone rode the pony.

These are the children, many from migrant farm families, who have probably lived in camps, farms, or on the edge of cities for most of their lives. Yet, the experience of going to a "real" farm and seeing and touching animals up close was foreign to them.

The object of the field trip was to widen experiences and enrich backgrounds in order to increase basic communication skills. Basic communication skills enhancement has been the primary objective of our summer school conducted under Title I for the past two years.

Prior to going on the field trip, the teacher and the aide prepared the class by engaging in a number of readiness activities, i.e., discussing the types of animals they might see, the sounds these animals make, their appearance, et cetera. The readiness usually takes a day or two prior to the trip. The trip takes generally the better part of the school day.

On another occasion a field trip was made to the County Court House. It was discovered that some of the children did not have the concept of "elevator." It took much riding up and down in the elevator to convince the youngsters that the teachers weren't playing a "magic trick" which caused people to disappear.

A trip to the local Sheriff's Office sparked discussion about courts and laws and brought about the writing of a script for a radio play. Later the children learned their parts, acquired stage props, and produced a play.

We have found through working with the children in Basic Communication Skills that most of them truly lack understandings of what middle class people accept as natural parts of their environment. One teacher took her youngsters

on a field trip to a friend's house to show them a "backyard." On first hearing the word "backyard" and a brief description of what it was, their reaction was, "Oh, do you mean the camp?" The children were taken to the backyard and viewed with interest a flower garden, a sandbox, a swing, and a tether ball. Upon returning to school they discussed at length what they had seen, recording their impressions with art work and by dictating stories.

On the day following the field trip there is usually a good deal of discussion, then the children dictate to the teacher or to the aide their experience and impressions of the preceding day. Sometimes the stories are printed in newspaper form, booklet form, or on large sheets of paper and hung on easels for the class to see. Many youngsters who at the beginning of the Summer Session were very reticent, can hardly contain themselves now (and sometimes don't); they literally spurt out information relative to their experience.

It has been our finding that these field trip experiences, of which several were mentioned, have greatly sharpened the desire of the youngsters to communicate what they saw and heard, both in oral and written language. Also, the pre-readiness sessions and the post-discussion sessions bring out the desire to "look it up in books," to substantiate facts, and to find pictures illustrating their experiences. Many times the youngsters combine art work and creative expression relative to what they saw--pictures of farm animals, models, murals, et cetera.

Our primary goal in the Title I Summer Sessions has been to increase communication skills. The most effective plan for us employed the sequence of (1) readiness for a trip (2) the trip (3) post-evaluation, oral discussion and (4) application of the experiences in the creative activities, i.e., writing stories, dramatic play, artistic expressions.

From the point of view of compensatory education for the disadvantaged child, we feel the results of this type of experience achieved worthwhile and positive results.

C7-117 1-68 1,300